

condemnatory rejection of these presumed heresies, on the contrary, they proceeded to make a most impartial and thorough study of them. They met their exponents, on the friendliest terms, as far as their own attitude was concerned (that of the exponents, of course, they could not regulate), and they incorporated such elements of the new dispensation as seemed to them, after genuinely dispassionate review, to be sound. The same patient readiness to study, to learn, to take in new light, to admit new points of view, to attend to new voices, marks their attitude to Bolshevik Russia. They fought the hasty and unconsidered swallowing of it whole by certain sections of the British Labour movement, from 1917 on, they never concealed their view that the forward march of Socialism in other countries was being hindered, rather than helped, by the tactics of the Third International, but they never had any other general view than that here was a big thing, a big challenge, that must be met and understood. Silly to shut eyes to it sillier still to rush either into enthusiastic acceptance or rude derision about it. Some people might see it as likely to "blow the Webbs sky-high." What of it? If that were to turn out to be an accurate description, accuracy rather than the Webbs must be served, and they would be the first to say so.

Any such expectation however could only be entertained by critics who insist on taking an entirely one-sided view of what the Webbs stand for. Democracy is certainly important in their plan of Socialism, but so is the fact

that, always, it
has been a plan In the lecture on *Socialism,*
True and False, which he delivered before the Fabian
Society as far
back as 1894,¹ in which he rejects all the
varieties of what
he calls "spurious Collectivism" from
Insurrectionism to
Utopianism, he does so in favour of an
orderly planning
He compares the Fabians to the
Benthamites, and tells

¹ Reprinted in *Problems of Modern Industry*.